

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-20 are pending. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 1, 14, and 20 are the independent claims.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 20 has been rejected under 35 USC 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 20 has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11-17, 19, and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stein (US 6,704,621) in view of Sasaki (US 6,445,809). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Stein and Sasaki teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11-17, 19, and 20.

Claims 1, 14, and 20 recite, inter alia, "selecting one or more real-world points according to a tractability criterion inversely proportional with an uncertainty associated with localization of the real-world points."

Claims 1, 14, and 20 have been amended to include the limitations of allowable Claim 3. Therefore, Claims 1, 14, and 20 are believed to be allowable – the combined teachings of Stein

and Sasaki do not teach or suggest tractability criterion selecting one or more real-world points according to a tractability criterion inversely proportional with an uncertainty associated with localization of the real-world points. For example, Stein compares consecutive images to determine motion (see col. 5, lines 3-11.) Sasaki uses optical flows (see FIGS. 14A-I). The images and optical flow of Stein and Sasaki are not used in combination with a criterion inversely proportional with an uncertainty, essentially as claimed.

Claims 2, 4, 6-9, 11-13 depend from Claim 1. Claims 15-17, and 19 depend from Claim 14. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 10, and 18 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stein and Sasaki, in view of Breed (US 6,370,475). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Stein, Sasaki, and Breed teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 5, 10, and 18.

Claims 5 and 10 depend from Claim 1. Claim 18 depend from Claim 14. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1, 2, and 4-20 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 6/24/08

*Donald B. Paschburg*  
Donald B. Paschburg  
Reg. No. 33,753  
Attorney for Applicants

**Mailing Address:**

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Intellectual Property Department  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
(732) 321-3191  
(732) 321-3030 (FAX)